

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--|------------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/501,884 | 01/14/2005 | Steven H. Strauss | 296211-04US | 2011 |
| 25764 FAEGRE & BI | 7590 08/01/2007 ENSON LLP | | EXAM | INER |
| PATENT DOCKETING | | | SAVAGE, MATTHEW O | |
| 2200 WELLS FARGO CENTER 90 SOUTH SEVENTH STREET | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| MINNEAPOL | IS, MN 55402-3901 | | 1724 | |
| | | | | |
| | | • | MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
| | | | 08/01/2007 | PAPER |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

| | , | Application No. | Applicant(s) | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| Office Action Summary | | 10/501,884 | STRAUSS ET AL. | | | | |
| | | Examiner | Art Unit | | | | |
| | | Matthew O. Savage | 1724 | | | | |
| Period fo | The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply | ears on the cover sheet with the c | orrespondence address | | | | |
| WHIC - Exte after - If NC - Failu Any | ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DANSIONS of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. O period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period we use to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing ed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE | N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133). | | | | |
| Status | | | | | | | |
| 1) | Responsive to communication(s) filed on 7-28- | .06 | | | | | |
| ′= | | action is non-final. | | | | | |
| 3) | Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is | | | | | | |
| · •/ _ | closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. | | | | | | |
| Disposit | ion of Claims | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | | | | |
| _ | | | • | | | | |
| | 4) Claim(s) 1-78 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. | | | | | | |
| | 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. | | | | | | |
| | 6)☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6)☐ Claim(s) is/are rejected. | | | | | | |
| | Claim(s) is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. | | | | | | |
| · — | 8)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-78</u> are subject to restriction and/or election requirement. | | | | | | |
| Olem (3) 1-10 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement. | | | | | | | |
| Applicati | ion Papers | | • | | | | |
| 9)[| The specification is objected to by the Examiner | r. | | | | | |
| 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner. | | | | | | | |
| | Applicant may not request that any objection to the o | drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See | ∍ 37 CFR 1.85(a). | | | | |
| Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). | | | | | | | |
| 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152. | | | | | | | |
| Priority (| under 35 U.S.C. § 119 | • | · | | | | |
| 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: | | | | | | | |
| a) _i | a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. | | | | | | |
| | 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No | | | | | | |
| | Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage | | | | | | |
| | application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). | | | | | | |
| * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. | | | | | | | |
| 222 and amagined astailed a mod desirent for a not of the definited copies not received. | | | | | | | |
| | | | • | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| Attachmen | | _ | • | | | | |
| | e of References Cited (PTO-892) te of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da | | | | | |
| 3) 🔲 Infor | mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) Notice of Informal Pa | | | | | |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6) Other: | | | | | | | |

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-326 (Rev. 08-06) Application/Control Number: 10/501,884

Art Unit: 1724

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

 Claims 1-56, drawn to methods for removing and recovering ions, classified in class 210, subclass 683.

- II. Claims 57-73, drawn to a process for producing a solid ion extractant composition, classified in class 502, subclass 402.
- III. Claims 74-78, drawn to a compound, classified in class 521, subclass 38.

Inventions II and III are related as process of making and product made. The inventions are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make another and materially different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process (MPEP \S 806.05(f)). In the instant case the product could be made by another and materially different process, for example, using an olefin other than that specified in claim 58, for example, one where R^6 is a C_{19} alkylene compound.

Inventions I and III are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product. See MPEP § 806.05(h). In the instant case the product

could be used in a materially different process, for example, in a process for adsorbing materials without a support.

Inventions I and II are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different designs, modes of operation, and effects (MPEP § 802.01 and § 806.06). In the instant case, the different inventions have different modes of operation and different effects.

Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and there would be a serious burden on the examiner if restriction is not required because the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art in view of their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Art Unit: 1724

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions or species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions or species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C.103(a) of the other invention.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Matthew O. Savage whose telephone number is (571) 272-1146. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 7:00am-3:30pm.

> Matthew O. Sava Matthew O Savage **Primary Examiner** Art Unit 1724

mos